1. IDEE UNIWERSYTETU A ZARZĄDZANIE RYZYKIEM I MAJĄTKIEM UCZELNI

1.1. Changing idea of university education: innovations, initiatives and intentions[15]

An old idea of university for the brand new 21st century

What role is the university in the twenty first century to play? What shall it become and what new opportunities and limits technology, individual intentions and innovations impose? What are the new challenges for education, entrepreneurship and the new economy, dominated by increasingly disruptive social media and the Internet? In order to address these questions we need to understand the different models, motivations and perspectives from different countries and regions.

In his classic book: *Idea of a University*, written in mid-1800, Newman[16] shows different aspects of the university, depending on whether we look at the subject from the point of view of education or knowledge. Newman states in that classic book: "when the Church founds a University, she is not cherishing talent, genius or knowledge, for their own sake, but for the sake of her children, with a view to their spiritual

[15] Mark M. Michalski, Catholic University of America, Washington, USA; Huaqiao University, Xiamen, Chiny.

[16] Newman in his volume on "The Idea of a University", he expounds with wonderful clarity of thought and of language his view of the aim of education. From the Introductory Note: "The University does contemplate a necessity of our nature, and is but one specimen in a particular medium. Mutual education, in a large sense of the word, is one of the great and incessant occupations of human society, carried on partly with set purpose, and partly not. One generation forms another; and the existing generation is ever acting and reacting upon itself in the persons of its individual members. Now, in this process, books, I need scarcely say, that is, one special instrument. It is true; and emphatically so in this age. Considering the prodigious powers of the press, and how they are developed at this time in the never – intermitting issue of periodicals, tracts, pamphlets, works in series, and light literature, we must allow there never was a time which promised fairer for dispensing with every other means of information and instruction. What can we want more, you will say, for the intellectual education of the whole man, and for every man, than so exuberant and diversified and persistent a promulgation of all kinds of knowledge? Why, you will ask, need we go up to knowledge, when knowledge comes down to us? The Sibyl wrote her prophecies upon the leaves of the forest, and wasted them; but here such careless profusion might be prudently indulged, for it can be afforded without loss, in consequence of the almost fabulous fecundity of the instrument which these latter ages have invented".

welfare and their religious influence and usefulness, with the object of training them to fill their respective posts in life better, and of making them more intelligent, capable, active members of society" (Newman, XII). Is that noble idea still alive and well? This papers examines this and related issues of university education

Newman, writing in the mid-19th century shared his vision of higher education that takes into account major challenges that were as prevalent then as they are in or time. Newman found three tendencies: utilitarianism, secularism and rationalism, as predominant. By utilitarianism Newman meant the movement associated with Jeremy Bentham. The editors of Edinburgh Review (Lord H. Brougham, Sydney Smith) proposed to dethrone the classics and to replace it with "useful" knowledge leading to a trade or profession. Newman believed and insisted that the primary end of education was not the acquisition of useful information or skills needed for a particular occupation in life, but cultivation of the mind. The supreme fruit of education, was to practice what he called the "philosophical habit of mind". Thus, study of the classics help reinforce, refine, and redirect the intellectual powers of a person.

The second area was danger of secularism. The exclusion of religious knowledge from higher education. The absence of theology, Newman believed, would throw the other branches of knowledge out of balance. Many of us have experienced how some professors tend to operate as though their specializations qualified them to give a complete account of reality. Theology is needed to keep the secular disciplines within their proper limits and deal with questions that lie beyond their scope.

And third, rationalism, places the intellectual cultivation of human mind as the measure of all things. By absolutizing its own standards and goals, the university aspires for full autonomy. The teachings that university education should not be confined to produce an efficient work force for the factory or the marketplace, and should not exalt the technical over the spiritual, are still valid today. We need to recognize the universal humanism along with organic vision of reality.[17]

Educating for life long-employment – and employing new life-long learning

Our global world is not only becoming ever more interconnected, but fast becoming a disruptively different place. We are fascinated by new technological innovations and capabilities, and we succumb to cultural relativism. With emergence of "network society", globalization and modernization impose greatest challenges to individuals and young students – millennial generation. We need to become prepared to live and work in a world where people collaborate with diverse cultural backgrounds, appreciate different ideas, perspectives and values. In other words, a world where people can collaborate across many cultural and social differences. 21st century will help students develop more freedom, autonomy and identity that equips them to join others in life, work, and citizenship.

[17] Our modern heritage depends still heavily on these three propositions of Newman. We might add another important one as advanced by the then Pope Benedict XVI, the notion of totalitarian relativism, where no absolute truth exist, but only subjective or individualistic ones.

A generation ago, teachers could expect that what they taught would last for a lifetime of their students. Today, we need to prepare students for rapid economic and social changes. For jobs that have not yet been created, for using technologies that have not yet been invented. To solve social problems that we don't yet realize that may soon arise. 21st century skills that will help, perhaps even thrive, amid unexpected disruptions.

The dilemma for us is that routine skills, that are easiest to teach and to test, are also the skills that are easiest to digitize, automate, and outsource. There is no question that state-of-the-art knowledge and skills in a discipline will always remain important. Innovative or creative people generally have specialized skills in a field of knowledge or a practice. And as much as "learning to learn" skills are important, we always learn by learning something. However, educational success is no longer about reproducing content knowledge, but about extrapolating from what we know and applying that knowledge in novel situations. The world no longer rewards people for what they know but for what they can do with what they know. That is the key differentiator today, global education today needs to be much more about ways of thinking, involving creativity, critical thinking, problem-solving and decision-making.

Our approach to problems of the past was breaking them down into manageable bits and pieces, and then to teach students the techniques to solve them. Today we create value by synthesizing the dissimilar bits. This is about open-mindedness, making connections between ideas that previously seemed unrelated. It requires being familiar with and receptive to knowledge in other fields than our own. If we spend our whole life in a silo of a single discipline, we will not gain the imaginative skills to connect the dots where the next invention will come from.

The world can no longer be divided into specialists and generalist. Specialists generally have deep skills and narrow scope, giving them expertise that is recognized by peers but not valued outside their domain. Generalists have broad scope but shallow skills. What counts today are those who are able to apply depth of skill to a widening scope of circumstances. They are capable not only of constantly adapting but also of constantly learning and growing, of positioning themselves and repositioning themselves in a fast changing world.

Equally important, the more content knowledge we can search and access, the more important becomes the capacity to make sense out of this content, the capacity of individuals to question or seek to improve the accepted knowledge and practices of their time. In the past, one could ask students to look into an encyclopedia when they needed some information. One could tell them that they generally could rely on what they found to be true. Today, it is about managing non-linear information, building mental representation of information as you find your own way through the internet. It is about dealing with ambiguity, interpreting and resolving conflicting pieces of information that we find somewhere on the web.

Perhaps most importantly, in today's schools, students typically learn individually and at the end of the school year, we certify their individual achievements. But the more interdependent the world becomes, the more we need great collaborators and orchestrators. Innovation today is rarely the product of individuals working in isola-

tion but an outcome of how we mobilize, share and link knowledge. In the flat world, everything that is our proprietary knowledge today will be a commodity available to everyone else tomorrow. Because technology has enabled us to act on our imaginations in ways that we could never before, value is less and less created vertically through command and control – because everyone can do that anywhere in the world – but increasingly so horizontally by whom we connect and work with. Success will be with those who master the new forms of collaboration.

University Reform in Polish Context

Professor Marek Kwiek[18], writing at Center for Public Policy Studies, UNESCO Chair in Institutional Research and Higher Education Policy University of Poznan, wrote an insightful report titled "Constructing Universities as Organizations: University Reforms in Poland in the Light of Institutional Theory". Kwiek stated: "Reforming universities does not lead to their completed reforms, however, as examples from major European higher education systems show, reforming, instead, is leading to further waves of reforms as 'reforms generate reforms' (…). This is the case in Poland, where the most recent (2009–2012) wave of reforms is not perceived by policymakers as making universities finally 'complete' or 'true' or 'fully fledged' organizations (…). More legal changes and a new national strategy for higher education are expected to emerge in the next few years. Thus universities are thought to be ever more 'complete', without a belief that modernization policies will make them 'complete' soon" (Kwiek 2016, 193).

These practical changes at the organizational levels, eventually promote effective reforms. Small and ongoing changes, accompanied by pragmatic policies, with specific market oriented, job-related academic narratives – produce new university ideals.

Research on utilitarian change focuses mostly on the role of implementing changes caused by external environs. This usually leads to institutional reforms. The literature that appeared in recent times offers rich empirical data to assess institutional models. Changes – either drastic or gradual may lead to much better functioning of institutions. These changes might occur in a relatively short periods of time. In Poland, that period occurred in 2009–2012. Between them there may be long intervals of institutional stability (Pierson 2004, 134–135). The theories of institutional change may be applied to a system of higher education. This shows an extraordinary rate of change and which is exposed to broad, or even fundamental reforms.

From Learning Institutions to Institutions of Continuous Learning

The reforms of Polish universities until quite recently, namely to 2009 were practically non-existent, cosmetic, or largely left untouched. Following the initial minor changes soon after the collapse of communism in 1989, the main goal geared

[18] Professor Kwiek is one of the leading Polish intellectuals concerned with the nature and direction of higher education.

toward adopting to the new post-communist reality. The market-oriented reality was slower than adaptations in other public sectors, businesses, pension programs, healthcare services, or even primary and secondary education. These latter ones were quite quickly and effectively reformed during the mid-1990s. In the late 1990s and early 2000s, higher education system was guided by new laws on higher education. The core of the reforms included keeping its uncompetitive funding models, with heavily administrative governance and a complex, multi-level academic procedures for degrees and careers. These remained practically the same until the early 2010s (Kwiek 2014).

Recent reforms in Polish higher education – as well as decade-long reforms of the healthcare system – can be interpreted as a way of 'constructing organizations' out of public services, a way of 'turning public services into organizations. They can also be interpreted – in a different set of concepts – as part of large-scale global attempts leading to 'the rationalization of universities as organizations'. And this was the Polish case. Polish universities as they emerged from a new governance and funding architecture introduced in 2009–2012 were no longer being viewed by the policymakers as traditional academic institutions. They were viewed, and urged to view themselves (with some limited success), as rational, modern organizations.

The Changing Academic Profession

Polish universities operate according to traditional, German-lead rules (i.e. Humboldtian). That means, the rules of the university as a 'community of scholars'. There are four visions of the university, as presented by Olsen (2007, 29–31). An institution based on academic values, to an extent unparalleled in Western European higher education systems. In Western Europe, the existence of different models is prevalent. In Poland reforms intended to replace a traditional model, transformed in the last two decades, with Olsen's model of the university as an 'instrument for national political agendas'. The Polish policymakers did not seem to have envisaged any co-existence of various models. Instead, replacement of models seems to have been proposed, in theoretical terms.

The Polish reform program, as in most other European countries, is driven by an instrumental view of the university, while the logic of changes suggested by the Polish academic community is institutional (Olsen 2007). The instrumental/institutional divide is where powerful tensions related to new reforms have their roots. In Poland, as opposed to Western European systems, it was academically-driven institutional logic in the last two decades that seems to have institutionalized research mission in public universities. Academic values and rules will be gravitating towards the instrumental model. Organization and funding mechanisms in Polish universities are already becoming fundamentally transformed. Polish reforms meet the four basic attributes which make it easier to pursue reforms: reform ideas from 2009–2012 are simple, reforms are normative, they tend to be one-sided, and are clearly future-oriented (Brunsson 2009, 91–92).

The Emergence of the Networked University in the Networked Society

One of the big and widely unreported paradigm shifts in our world has been the growth of networked society through the Internet and social media. This shift also affects how we think and how we keep informed, educated and organized. It enables a whole world to enter into universities: accessibility, web links, clusters, hotspots, open source, open access, virtual, free, and distant learning – are the buzz words of this disruptive innovations.

One of the central questions is: what are the new or alternative ways of organizing and conceptualizing university role in such a networked society. We may look at the idea of university as a pyramid, pillar or web. Or even as a combination of these three abovementioned images. Images help us reflect on some essential elements.

In the history of the university one of the major shift occurred with print discovery. In most recent times, we witness a major shift caused by emergence, or convergences of Internet with social media. Put it differently: all giant shifts took place from renaissance, to enlightenment, to modernity. That gradual transition took place over several centuries. Today, great changes are taking place in the midst of us. As one of the images – the medieval-renaissance university, it took a form of a pyramid, or hierarchical learning. The society of stratified social class going from lower level to the top. During the enlightenment era, a new structure emerged. During this period, society moved away from the pyramid to a pillar model. Different entities no longer belonged to one structure but grew and emerged separately and independently from one another. The corresponding relationship between teachers and students underwent a significant change. A vertical transmission of (increasingly specialized) knowledge replaced the layered knowledge.

As we are fast moving into the network society, or interconnected web of networks, we mirror the Internet, which after all is the network of networks. The web is driven by networks, interdisciplinary connections, real and virtual meeting points and collaborations. All possible at both local and international, or global level.

According to the recent OECD report titled "Education Policy Outlook 2015: Making Reforms Happen"[19], about 12% of public spending is invested in education. However, there is high variation in how that money is spent and the outcomes it produces. The report gives an in-depth picture of some 400 education reforms that were adopted by OECD countries (from 2008–2014). Many countries have introduced policies that support disadvantaged students or schools with diverse student populations. Exemplary policies include New Zealand's support to their Pacifica populations, or England's Pupil Premium, or Chile's Law on Preferential Subsidies.

Australia and Poland meanwhile, have focused on enlarging enrolment in, and improving the quality of, early childhood education and care. Some 29% of reform measures considered in the report aim to better prepare students for the future. Many countries have focused on improving the quality and relevance of their vocational

[19] Poland is one of the 34 members of the OECD countries where mutual interests and concerns for growth and development are regularly analyzed, discussed and reported.

education and training (VET) programs, on expanding their work-based training and apprenticeship systems. Denmark and Sweden reformed their VET programs. Many countries also introduced policies to ensure that students can find a job or a place in further education. National qualifications frameworks have also been revised, often in collaboration with the European Union, to increase transparency across education systems.

Policies related to teachers are becoming a priority: Australia created the Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership, and the Netherlands developed a Teacher Program. France and the United States concentrated on improving initial teacher training, while Finland adopted measures to create a system of professional development for school staff. Some of the Nordic countries and Japan reformed their curricula. To guide their reform efforts, school systems rely on evaluation and assessment.

Given that the governance of education systems is becoming increasingly complex (10% of reforms address governance issues), some countries have elaborated overarching visions for their education systems (Denmark's Folkeskole reform and Canada's nationally agreed strategies and priorities) or have refined roles and responsibilities, either by creating new institutions or by reorganizing local governance arrangements (Estonia).

To be successful, innovations in the university environment must concretely address specific issues. And to improve the quality of the education that schools provide, policies must focus on changing technologies, balancing external pressure and support, and developing and pursuing long-term objectives. More generally, the analysis of selected reforms shows that the most effective policies are those that are designed around students and learning, build teachers' capacity, and engage all stakeholders. In most OECD countries, teachers' unions and business establishments, in particular, are becoming increasingly involved in policy implementation. Teachers' unions are calling for more structured dialogue with governments, while the business sector is keen to establish closer links with education systems. As important, the analysis shows that once new policies are adopted, there is little follow-up. Only 10% of the policies considered in this dataset have been evaluated for their impact. Measuring policy impact more rigorously and consistently will not only be cost-effective in the long run, it is also essential for developing the most useful solutions.

Concluding Remarks

Universities need to prepare students to live and work in a world in which most people collaborate and appreciate different ideas, perspectives and values, often bridging space and time through technology; and a world in which lives are increasingly affected by issues that transcend national boundaries. 21st century schools help students to develop autonomy and identity that is cognizant of the reality of national and global pluralism, able to join others in life, work, and citizenship.

We may not know exactly how things will unfold, we need to learn from the extraordinary, disruptive innovations and inventions. We also learn from mistakes. And

it will often be the mistakes, when properly understood, that create the context for learning and growth. A generation ago, teachers could expect that what they taught would last for a lifetime of their students. Today, schools need to prepare students for more rapid economic and social change than ever before, for jobs that have not yet been created, to use technologies that have not yet been invented, and to solve social problems that we don't yet know will arise.

21st century skills help people, organizations and systems persist, perhaps even thrive, amid unforeseeable disruptions. And at the aggregate level, they provide communities, institutions and infrastructure with the needed flexibility, intelligence and responsiveness to economic and social change.

How do we foster motivated, engaged learners who are prepared to conquer the unforeseen challenges of tomorrow, not to speak of those of today? The dilemma for educators is that routine cognitive skills, the skills that are easiest to teach and easiest to test, are also the skills that are easiest to digitize, automate, and outsource. Innovative or creative people generally have specialized skills in a field of knowledge or a practice. And as much as "earning to learn" skills are important, we always learn by learning something. However, educational success is no longer about reproducing content knowledge, but about extrapolating from what we know and applying that knowledge in novel situations.

The main differentiator, global education today needs to be much more about ways of thinking, involving creativity, critical thinking, problem-solving and decision-making; about ways of working, including communication and collaboration; about tools for working, including the capacity to recognize and exploit the potential of new technologies; and, last but not least, about the social and emotional skills that help us live and work together.

Finally, and most importantly, nowadays students typically learn individually and at the end of the school year. Universities certify their individual achievements. While the more interdependent the world becomes, the more we need great collaborators and co-directors. Innovation is becoming rarely the product of individuals working in isolation. It is an outcome of how we share and link knowledge. In the flat world, everything that is our proprietary knowledge today will be a commodity available to everyone else tomorrow. Technology enables us to act on our imaginations in ways that we could never before. Value is less and less created vertically through command and control and increasingly horizontally. Successful education may remain with those who master the new ways and formulas of collaboration.

Bibliography

Barnett, R. (ed.) (2012). *The Future University: Ideas and Possibilities*. New York: Routledge.

Brunsson, N. (2009). *Reform as Routine: Organizational Change and Stability in the Modern World*. New York: Oxford University Press, 91–92.

Cerych, L., Sabatier, P. (1986). *Great Expectations and Mixed Performance: The Implementation of Higher Education Reforms in Europe*. Trentham: European Institute of Education and Social Policy.

Christensen, T. (2011). University Governance Reforms: Potential Problems of More Autonomy? *Higher Education*, 62, 503–517.

Kwiek, M. (2014). Structural Changes in the Polish Higher Education System (1990–2010): A Synthetic View. *European Journal of Higher Education*, 4, 3, 266–280.

Kwiek, M. (2015). Academic Generations and Academic Work: Patterns of Attitudes, Behaviors and Research Productivity of Polish Academics After 1989. *Studies in Higher Education*, 40, 8, 1354–1376.

Kwiek, M. (2015). From Privatization (of the Expansion Era) to De-privatization (of the Contraction Era): A National Counter-trend in a Global Context. In: S. Slaughter, B.J. Taylor (eds.), *Higher Education, Stratification, and Workforce Development. Competitive Advantage in Europe, the US and Canada*. Dordrecht: Springer, 311–329.

Kwiek, M. (2016). Constructing Universities as Organizations: University Reforms in Poland in the Light of Institutional Theory. In: E. Samier (ed.), *Educational Administration and Leadership*. New York: Routledge.

Maassen, P., Olsen, J.P. (eds.) (2007). *University Dynamics and European Integration*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Mahoney, J., Thelen, K. (eds.) (2010). *Explaining Institutional Change: Ambiguity, Agency, and Power*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Newman, J.H. (1948). *The Uses of Knowledge*. New York: Macmillan.

OECD (2015). *Education Policy Outlook 2015: Making Reforms Happen*. Paris: OECD Publishing.

Olsen, J.P. (2007). The Institutional Dynamics of the European University. In: P. Maassen, J.P. Olsen (eds.), *University Dynamics and European Integration*. Dordrecht: Springer, 25–54.

Pierson, P. (2004). *Politics in Time: History, Institutions, and Social Analysis*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Pinheiro, R., Antonowicz, D. (2015). Opening the Gates or Copying with the Flow? Governing Access to Higher Education in Northern and Central Europe. *Higher Education*, 70, 3, 299–313.

Rolfe, G. (2013). *The University in Dissent: Scholarship in the Corporate University*. New York: Routledge.

Samier, E. (ed.) (206). *Educational Administration and Leadership*. New York: Routledge.

Selingo, J.J. (2016). *There Is Life after College: What Parents and Students Should Know about Navigating School to Prepare for the Job of Tomorrow*. New York: Harper Collins.

Stravinskas, P.M.J., Reilly, P.J. (eds.) (2001). *Newman's Idea of a University: The American Response*. Washington: Catholic University of America.